This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 25, 2004. Claims 1, 3 to 7, 9 to 15, 17 to 19, 21 to 24, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 41 remain pending in the application, with Claims 27, 32, 37 and 42 having been cancelled herein. Claims 1, 7, 15, 19, 23, 28, 33 and 38 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5 7, 9, 11, 15, 17, 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,076,106 (Hamner), and Claims 4, 6, 10, 12 to 14, 18, 22 to 24, 26 to 29, 31 to 34, 36 to 39, 41 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hamner in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,266,693 (Onaga). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns managing of device information for network devices. According to one aspect of the invention, a plurality of types of device information is transmitted to a management server for managing the network devices. The plurality of types of device information may be static information, semi-static information which is obtained periodically at a first time interval, and dynamic information that is obtained periodically at a second time interval different from the first time interval. (See, for example, Figs. 11 and 12, and page 25, line 13 to page 27, line 11.) The static information may be transmitted in accordance with a power-on of the device, and the semi-static and dynamic information may be transmitted in accordance with a change in status of the device. As a result, the device information of network devices can be readily managed by a server.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a method of processing device information in a network system in which a management

server for managing the device information and various other devices are connected, comprising a transmitting step of transmitting a plurality of different types of device information to management server at predetermined timings, respectively, wherein the plurality of different types of device information are static information, semi-static information obtained periodically at a first time interval, and dynamic information obtained periodically at a second time interval different from the first time interval, and wherein, in the transmitting step, the static information is transmitted to the management server in accordance with a power-on of the device, and the semi-static information and the dynamic information are transmitted to the management server in accordance with a change in status of the device.

Amended independent Claims 7, 15 and 19 are apparatus, recording medium, and computer program claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 1.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 1, 7, 15 and 19. More particularly, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a device transmitting a plurality of different types of device information to a management server at predetermined timings, respectively, wherein the plurality of different types of device information are static information, semi-static information obtained periodically at a first time interval, and dynamic information obtained periodically at a second time interval different from the first time interval.

Hamner is merely seen to disclose a management server that implements control software to gather information about all devices connected to the network in order to generate a network map. The information is gathered either periodically or in response

to a user command. Once the devices have been discovered, the management server can perform various tasks on each of the devices. (See column 3, lines 31 to 62, and column 6, lines 3 to 18.) Thus, although the server may discover devices and obtain device information, Applicants fail to see where any of the devices transmit a plurality of different types of device information to a management server at predetermined timings, respectively, wherein the plurality of different types of device information are static information, semi-static information obtained periodically at a first time interval, and dynamic information obtained periodically at a second time interval different from the first time interval. Accordingly, amended independent Claims 1, 7, 15 and 19 are not believed to be anticipated by Hamner.

Onaga is not seen to disclose or to suggest anything that, when combined with Hamner, would have overcome Hamner's deficiencies or that would have rendered the present invention of Claims 1, 7, 15 and 19 obvious. In this regard, Onaga is merely seen to disclose a multifunction device that determines its operating status and transmits status information to a host, whereby the host transmits the status information to a file server. However, like Hamner, Onaga is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a device transmitting a plurality of different types of device information to a management server at predetermined timings, respectively, wherein the plurality of different types of device information are static information, semi-static information obtained periodically at a first time interval, and dynamic information obtained periodically at a second believed to operate opposite the present invention. Accordingly, Claims 1, 7, 15 and 19 also would not have been obvious over a combination of Hamner and Onaga.

In view of the forgoing amendments and remarks, Claims 1, 3 to 7, 9 to 15, 17 to 19, 21 and 22 are believed to be allowable.

In another, related aspect of the invention, one of various devices on a network transmits to another one of the various devices a request that a plurality of types of device information of the one device that transmitted the request be transmitted from the another device to the management server, whereby the another device receives the request and transmits the plurality of types of device information of the one device that transmitted the request to the management server. However, the another device also recognizes whether the one device is in a properly operating status, and if the one device is not in the properly operating status, transmits a request to the management server that the device information of the one device registered in the management server be deleted. (See, e.g., step S1812 of Fig. 18 and page 41, line 19 to page 42, line 13.) As a result, if the one device is unable to transmit its own device information to the management server, a substitute-device can transmit the information instead so that the device information is updated/deleted in the server.

Amended independent Claim 23 is a method of processing device information in a network system in which a management server for managing device information and various other devices are connected, comprising a request transmitting step of transmitting, from one of the various devices to another one of the various devices, a request that a plurality of types of device information of the one device that transmitted the request be transmitted from the another device to the management server, a receiving step of receiving by the another device the request transmitted by the one device in the request transmitting step, a device information transmitting step of transmitting, from the another device to the management server, the plurality of types of device information of the one device that transmitted the request in accordance with the received request, a recognizing step of recognizing by the another device whether the one device is in a

properly operating status, and a delete request transmitting step of transmitting from the another device to the management server, a request that the device information of the one device registered in the management server be deleted, if it is recognized in the recognizing step that the one device is not in the properly operating status.

Amended independent Claims 28, 33 and 38 are apparatus, computer program, and recording medium claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 23.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of amended independent Claims 23, 28, 33 and 38, and in particular is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a device that receives a request to transmit device information of another device to a management server recognizing whether the one device that transmitted the request is in a properly operating status, and transmitting to the management server a request that the device information of the one device registered in the management server be deleted if it is recognized that the one device is not in the properly operating status.

The Office Action more or less concedes that Hamner fails to disclose a device that receives a request from another device to transmit device information of the another device to a management server, but cites Onaga as allegedly disclosing the flow of information between a multifunction device, a file server and a workstation. However, even if Onaga could be found to disclose all that it is cited for, a point which Applicants don't concede, the fact that information can flow between the three devices as alleged simply falls short of disclosing that any one of the three devices transmits a request to another one of the devices that the another one of the devices transmit device information of the one device to the file server. Moreover, neither Hamner or Onaga are seen to disclose anything with regard to the device that receives the request to transmit the device

- 18 -

information of the another device to the management server recognizing whether the one device that transmitted the request is in a properly operating status, and transmitting to the management server a request that the device information of the one device registered in the management server be deleted if it is recognized that the one device is not in the properly operating status. Thus, amended independent Claims 23, 28, 33 and 38, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable over the applied art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 112-20
Facsimile: (212) 218-20

CA_MAIN 89065v1

- 19 -